# **EXHIBIT 3-F**

# SAMPLE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CONSULTANT PROPOSALS

CON	SULTANT
	RANKING FACTORS
1. Q	UALITY OF THE PROPOSAL
a.	Does the proposal respond comprehensively to the tasks outlined in the request for proposals (RFP)? <b>Comments:</b>
b.	Does the proposal reflect a good understanding of the technical issues involved in the project? <b>Comments:</b>
C.	Does the proposal indicate an understanding of the requirements that must be complied with for a TSEP project (and the other state and/or federal funding sources involved)? What experience has the firm had dealing with state or federal grant or loan programs? What experience has the firm had with lending institutions or financial consultants? What experience has the firm had helping communities get financing from commercial sources (banks, bond sales)? <b>Comments:</b>
d.	Has the consultant provided a clear description of how the work will be managed and how the consultant will coordinate with local officials and staff? How does the firm plan to handle public participation in this project? <b>Comments:</b>
e.	Has the consultant provided a step by step timetable for the work with milestones indicating when key tasks will be performed and by whom? Does the schedule appear complete and realistic? <b>Comments:</b>

### **ENGINEERING ONLY:**

- f. Did the proposal include more than one technical alternative? If so, do the alternatives appear appropriate to the community's location, size, and financial and physical constraints? **Comments:**
- g. Does the recommended alternative minimize long-term operation and maintenance costs? **Comment:**

### SCORE FOR QUALITY OF PROPOSAL:

S
•

### 2. CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- a. Does the consultant have experience with similar projects for similar sized communities? Which communities have they worked with in the recent past?

  Comment:
- b. Does the staff to be assigned to the project on a day-to-day basis have technical training and experience appropriate to the scope of work in the RFP? **Comment:**
- c. To what extent will qualified staff be available to supervise project staff on-site? Who will do the actual work on the engineering design and supervise construction? Does the firm use subcontractors for certain work? If so, which firms and for what work?

#### Comment:

- d. If the consultant has done work previously for the community, how did they perform?

  Comment:
- e. How do previous clients rate the consultant's performance? What is the consultant's track record on similar projects for timely performance within original budgets?
  Comment:
- f. Are the reference checks supportive of the consultant's technical abilities and ability to work cooperatively with local officials? **Comment:**

#### **ENGINEERING ONLY:**

- g. Does the firm have experience in designing similar systems for similar sized communities? What types of systems has the firm actually recommended, designed and installed? When were they installed? How are these systems working? What were the estimated costs? What are the present operation and maintenance costs of these systems? **Comments:**
- h. What are the costs per dwelling served, the up-front assessments, and monthly user charges for the firm's most recent projects of a size and technology comparable to yours? **Comments:**
- i. Does the firm have any experience using technologies and maintenance programs that are different from what State agencies have traditionally accepted? Does the firm have the willingness and capability to utilize innovative or alternative technology where appropriate? **Comments:**

j.	How familiar is the firm with current laws and regulations? <b>Comments:</b>	
k.	What experience does the firm have in working with State and Federal environmental and funding agencies? <b>Comments:</b>	
SCORE FOR CONSULTANT EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS:		
	BEST (200 POINTS) ABOVE AVERAGE (150 POINTS) AVERAGE (100 POINTS) BELOW AVERAGE (50 POINTS) POOR (0 POINTS)	
3. AVAILABILITY AND CAPACITY OF THE CONSULTANT		
a.	What is the current and projected workload of the consultant and how much time will the consultant have available to devote to the project? What projects is the firm now working on and what new ones may be starting soon? <b>Comments:</b>	
b.	Where is the firm located? Comments:	
C.	How much time will the firm's staff actually spend in the community on a day-to-day basis over the term of the project? <b>Comments</b> :	

SCORE FOR AVAILABILITY AND CAPACITY OF THE CONSULTANT:
BEST (100 POINTS) ABOVE AVERAGE (75 POINTS) AVERAGE (50 POINTS) BELOW AVERAGE (25 POINTS) POOR (0 POINTS)
DATE:

Is the consultant capable of meeting the time and budget requirements for the project? What time schedule does the firm propose for completing the work? **Comment:** 

Note: The above factors and questions under them are examples which are designed to fulfill Montana's law regarding procurement of engineering, architectural, or surveying services. You may want to adapt your RFP, including your evaluation factors and system for awarding points, to the key issues involved in your project and the type of assistance you are seeking. If you modify the sample factors or questions, please keep in mind that Montana law (Section 18-8-204, MCA) sets out minimum criteria that should be considered for selection of architects, engineers, or surveyors. The factors involved in reviewing responses to an RFP for management services may be different from those involved in an RFP for engineering services.